The Classical Review

<http://journals.cambridge.org/CAR>

Additional services for *The Classical Review*:

Email alerts: [Click here](#)

Subscriptions: [Click here](#)

Commercial reprints: [Click here](#)

Terms of use : [Click here](#)

Lucretiana

J. P. Postgate

The Classical Review / Volume 14 / Issue 07 / October 2009, pp 352 - 353

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00083098, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00083098

How to cite this article:

J. P. Postgate (1900). Lucretiana. The Classical Review, 14, pp 352-353 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00083098

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

Thus we get this final result in Attic Prose

Imperfects and Pluperfects.

A=84. consisting of 49 cases after *ῶτι* etc., and 45 after Relatives.

Optatives and Graphic.

B=87. consisting of 66 cases after *ῶτι* etc., 21 after Relatives.

NOTE.—As I have ignored all Fut: Indicatives or Optatives, it would be fairer to omit the nine cases with *ἐμελλε*. This will change the figures to:—

A=85. consisting of 45 cases after *ῶτι* etc., and 40. after Relatives.

B=87. consisting of 66 cases after *ῶτι* etc., and 21 after Relatives.

The conclusion of the whole matter seems to be as follows:—in any clause of Reported Statement, Dependent Question, etc., a Future Indicative or Future Optative may stand: but an Objective Imperfect or Pluperfect occurs (1) regularly when the principal clause is (a) non-personal, or, what is equivalent to non-personal; (b) negated or quasi-negated: (2) in about 50 per cent. cases after verbs of perceiving, knowing etc., and then (c) a plain relative is preferred, and (d) a direct interrogative is never used.

H. DARNLEY NAYLOR.

ORMOND COLLEGE.
MELBOURNE UNIVERSITY.

LUCRETIANA.

III. 992 sqq.

Sed Tityos nobis hic est in amore iacentem quem uolucres lacerant atque exest anxius angor
aut alia quavis scindunt cuppedine curae.

I print the MS. text even in the last line, though Bruno's emendation adopted by Brieger is very plausible.

993 could hardly have been defended so long, but for the presence of a phantom interpretation by which the mind of the commentator has been unconsciously confused. Lucretius might have said: The man *whom the birds devour* is with us: he is the man 'quem exest anxius angor, &c.' But he has not said this, for 'uolucres lacerant' belongs to the description of the unfortunate victim of whom Tityos is said to be the allegory; nor would he have said it when he had just devoted eight lines to what the birds had been doing to Tityos. The addition 'quem uolucres lacerant,' correct though wholly superfluous as a description of the Giant, is absurd (as Brieger has seen) when transferred to the lover whom the Giant typifies. A mere inspection of the context shows that Lucretius throughout keeps allegory and interpretation sharply distinct. In the myth of Tantalus there is an overhanging stone: in real life there is fear of heaven's wrath and calamity. In that of Sisyphus there is a rolling stone: in real life a fruitless pursuit of office. In that of the Danaids a leaky jar: in real life unsatisfied desire. Giussani indeed finds the use of *uolucres*

'only a little bolder' than the double sense of *casum* in the application of the myth of Tantalus and that of *iacentem*—'Acherunte iacentem' (984), 'in amore iacentem'—but he forgets that these double meanings help the reader to understand the correspondence between the myth and the reality, performing in fact the same function as *lacerant exest* and *scindunt*, instead of mocking him by saying, 'In reality the prey of the birds is the lover whom the birds prey on.' Munro's examples for the use of *atque* in the sense of *id est* do not of course touch this objection. Brieger would make *uolucres* an adjective, supposing a lacuna such as <curae summeque sequaces | et dolor usque recens>. The supplement is criticised by Giussani, and not without justice. The fact is, the expression is already as full as it need, I had almost said as it can be. It might be thought that *iacentem* is corrupt and should be replaced by a noun in agreement with *uolucres*. It is however difficult to think of an appropriate one, as *curae* is out of the question: and *iacentem*, though of course it might have come from 982, is in itself unobjectionable. Compare *iacere* in a similar connexion Prop. 1. 6. 25, Tib. 2. 5. 109.

It accordingly seems more likely that *uolucres* has intruded from the same line and has taken the place of a word which expressed some torment of love. *Stimuli* satisfies the conditions, and the piercing pricks of love were not likely to be omitted from a recital of its woes.

V. 1009 *sqq.*

illi imprudentes ipsi sibi saepe uenenum
uergebant: nunc dant sollertius ipsi.

The MSS. have *nudant*: but that *nunc dant* is certain, there is general agreement. It however stops there. Lucretius' theme is that in early times the loss of human life was not greater but rather less than now, as the increase of knowledge has been turned to ill account. The destruction of life was formerly accidental: now it is wilful and criminal. Deaths were caused once by taking poison accidentally: the mortality now is due to its being administered (*dant*). Of *ipsi* (nom.) Munro wrote that it was 'quite meaningless' and most scholars since have agreed with him. As Giussani however writes that it is 'an intentional repetition of the poet, a repetition full of irony,' it may be just as well to say that it is necessary to prove that in sentences of the type 'quondam ipsi sibi uenenum uergebant, nunc aliis (Giussani's text) dant' a second *ipsi* is Latin before accusing it of irony. The simplest alteration is *ipsis* (Bergk, Polle, Purmann). But neither *Marsis* or *Colchis* nor *patribus* is satisfactory; the first two because they make the allusion needlessly remote and artificial, the third because it leaves *sollertius* without its ablative. I should much prefer *medicis*, which agrees very well with *dant*, almost a technical term of physic, as we may see from turning the pages of Celsus. It seems better to place the word before *nunc dant*. Considerations of haplography have been no help in the present passage; and simple omissions of

words are found elsewhere in the text of Lucretius, as IV. 526, V. 736, 776, VI. 112.

VI. 82 *sqq.*

quamquam sunt a me multa profecta,
multa tamen restant et sunt ornanda politis
uersibus est ratio caeli <species>que
tenenda,
sunt tempestates et fulmina clara canenda
qui faciant et qua de causa cumque ferantur.

In line 83 I print Munro's supplement as the best hitherto proposed: Brieger's criticism upon it seems mistaken: on the other hand Brieger is right in objecting to *tenenda*. As I have said before, Lucretius is speaking throughout this passage of exposition only: 'sunt a me multa profecta, ornanda politis uersibus, canenda': and *tenenda* = *intellegenda* introduces a reference to his own or his reader's thoughts wholly out of place. I propose *notanda* with which the idea of *uersibus* is carried on. Lucretius uses the word rather frequently in the later part of his poem, e.g. V. 1058 'pro uario sensu uaria res uoce notauit'; ib. 1090, 584, 612. It is worth noting that *ornata* and *notare* occur in the same context at V. 695, 'omnia dispositis signis ornata notarunt.' In the last line I print *qui faciant* for the MS. *quid faciant* (Bockemueller *qui fiant*), a change which was briefly defended in the Cambridge University Reporter of Dec. 15, 1896, where I also made the following suggestions: II. 1169 '*mores* saeculumque fatigat,' V. 387 *exalto* for 'ex alto.'

J. P. POSTGATE.

A SUPPLEMENT TO THE APPARATUS CRITICUS OF MARTIAL.

I.

It was Schneidewin who first divided the extant MSS. of Martial into three families, (A) the family of Excerpt MSS. (*HR T*), (B) the family of MSS. derived from the recension of Torquatus Gennadius (*P Q*), (C) the 'Vulgate' family, to which most of our MSS. belong (*EXABVCG*, etc.); and Friedlaender has shown that these three families represent in the main three distinct recensions or editions of the text of Martial, possibly in some cases the earlier and later forms in which the poet himself published

his epigrams. The first requisite therefore for an apparatus criticus of Martial is the presentation of the readings of each of these three rival versions, wherever they differ from each other.

But the student will look in vain to Schneidewin's edition for this information. Schneidewin did not know that *T* was a copy of *H* and consequently undeserving of notice where *H* was available; he omits all mention of *R*, save in the Appendix at the end of his second volume. In respect of the second family of MSS. he was even worse provided. He wrongly identified the lost